UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,797	09/12/2003	David D. Goodman	1001-003	6152
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			EXAMINER	
			BRINEY III, WALTER F	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2615		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Notice of About a success	10/660,797	GOODMAN, DAVID D.			
Notice of Abandonment	Examiner	Art Unit			
	WALTER F. BRINEY III	2615			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
This application is abandoned in view of:					
 Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office (a) ☐ A reply was received on (with a Certificate of N period for reply (including a total extension of time of, but it does not not to the period of the proposed reply was received on, but it does not not not not not not not not not not	failing or Transmission dated month(s)) which expired on), which is after the expiration of the			
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	n consists only of: (1) a timely filed ar Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); o	nendment which places the			
(c) ☑ A reply was received on <u>19 March 2008</u> but it does no non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (S	t constitute a proper reply, or a bona	fide attempt at a proper reply, to the			
(d) ☐ No reply has been received.					
 Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8 (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was	5). received on (with a Certifica	ate of Mailing or Transmission dated			
(b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance	e of \$ is due.				
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ 1	The publication fee, if required by 37	CFR 1.18(d), is \$			
(c) \square The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has no	ot been received.				
 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as requal Allowability (PTO-37). (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on 					
after the expiration of the period for reply.					
(b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.					
 The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants. 	e attorney or agent of record, the assi	ignee of the entire interest, or all of			
5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.					
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claim		e the period for seeking court review			
7. X The reason(s) below:					
See Continuation Sheet					
/wfb/	/Suhan Ni/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit	t 2614			
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdra	w the holding of abandonment under 37 (CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to			

Item 7 - Other reasons for holding abandonment: The instant amendment fails to fully comply with USPTO amendment practice since the amendment fails to list all claims. Specifically, claims 17-21 do not appear in the instant amendment. Applicant has received three notifications of non-compliance and non-responsiveness since the last Office Action filed 05 June 2006. In two of those notifications, claims 17-21 were mentioned for having incorrect status identifiers. Accordingly, Applicant should have known that claims 17-21 should be included with the correct status identifiers and not simply omitted from the record. Since Applicant has failed three times to further prosecution and because Applicant should have known to include claims 17-21 with the correct status identifiers, the omission of claims 17-21 is not simply inadvertent. Therefore, the instant response by Applicant is not a bona fide attempt to further prosecution. Because more than six months have elapsed since the last Office Action, Applicant cannot respond to correct this deficiency in a timely matter. For these reasons, this application is abandoned.